

Environmental Checklist Form (Initial Study)
County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning



Project title: "25066 & 25080 Mulholland Highway residences" / Project No. R2012-00803, R2012-00800 & R2012-00802 / Case No(s). (RENV 201200099, RPP 201200332 & RPP 201200333

Lead agency name and address: Los Angeles County, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1360, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Contact Person and phone number: Richard Claghorn, (213) 974-6278

Project sponsor's name and address: John Anthony Lewis, Architect, 6621 Smoke Tree Avenue, Oak Park, CA 91377

Project location: 25066 & 25080 Mulholland Highway, Calabasas, CA 91302
APN: 4455-018-028 & 4455-018-027 USGS Quad: Malibu Beach

Gross Acreage: 4.44 acres (2.74 acres for the east parcel and 1.7 acres for the west parcel)

General plan designation: See Community/Area wide Plan designation

Community/Area wide Plan designation: Malibu Local Coastal Plan, Rural Land III (one dwelling unit per two acres), Mountain Land (one dwelling unit per twenty acres)

Zoning: A-1-1 (Light Agriculture, one acre minimum lot size)

Description of project: Two new single-family residences on contiguous parcels, including a two-story, 6,918 square foot single-family residence with attached 629 square foot three car garage and 390 square foot basement on the east parcel (25066 Mulholland Highway) and a two-story, 5,005 square foot single-family residence with attached 640 square foot three-car garage on the west parcel (25080 Mulholland Highway). The east parcel is owned by Dr. Edward Betz and the west parcel is owned by Gayle L. Pepper. Proposed grading includes 980 cubic yards of cut and 980 cubic yards of fill for the east parcel. Estimated import is 100 cubic yards for the east parcel. Proposed grading for the west parcel includes 1,050 cubic yards of cut and 950 cubic yards of fill, plus 400 cubic yards of overexcavation / alluvial removal and compaction.

Surrounding land uses and setting: Both parcels are vacant hillside land fronting Mulholland Highway, which is classified as a Parkway on the County Highway Plan. The property immediately to the east is vacant, but most of the other parcels in the vicinity along Mulholland Highway are developed with single-family residences on large lots of similar size to the subject parcels. Many homes are located nearby to the east, west and north. The properties to the south are vacant and extend to Cold Creek, which is classified as an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA). The nearest ESHA is approximately 420 feet southwest of the subject parcels. The majority of the property is located within a Significant Watershed, a Sensitive Environmental Resource Area (SERA). The north part of the properties, extending approximately 100 feet south from Mulholland Highway, is not in a SERA. The properties are also within the Cold Creek Significant Ecological Area (SEA).

Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Public Agency

Approval Required

LA County Public Works

Grading and drainage plans, building permits

LA County Public Health

Septic systems and water wells

LA County Fire Department

Fuel modification plan, driveway access, approval for structures/fire sprinklers

CA Coastal Commission

Coastal Development Permit

Major projects in the area:

Project/Case No.

Description and Status

03-395/PM 27033

4 single-family lots; Tentative map approved 12/17/07

87058 / TR45465-02

7 single-family lots; Final map recorded 6/2/10

96209 / RCUP 200700131

Health retreat; approved 6/16/09

Reviewing Agencies: [See **CEQA Appendix B** to help determine which agencies should review your project]

Responsible Agencies

- ☐ None
Regional Water Quality Control Board:
☒ Los Angeles Region
☐ Lahontan Region
☒ Coastal Commission
☒ Army Corps of Engineers
☒ US Fish & Wildlife

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ None
☒ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
☒ National Parks
☐ National Forest
☐ Edwards Air Force Base
☒ Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mountains Area
☒ Native American Heritage Commission
☒ Mountains Recreation & Conservation Authority
☒ Las Virgenes MWD
☒ Las Virgenes USD

Regional Significance

- ☐ None
☐ SCAG Criteria
☐ Air Quality
☐ Water Resources
☐ Santa Monica Mtns. Area
☐

Trustee Agencies

- ☐ None
☒ State Dept. of Fish and Game
☒ State Dept. of Parks and Recreation
☐ State Lands Commission
☐ University of California (Natural Land and Water Reserves System)

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☒ DPW:
- Land Development Division (Grading & Drainage)
- Geotechnical & Materials Engineering Division
- Watershed Management Division (NPDES)
- Traffic and Lighting Division
- Environmental Programs Division
- Waterworks Division

- ☒ Fire Department
- Forestry, Environmental Division
- Planning Division
- Land Development Unit
- Health Hazmat
☒ Sanitation District
☒ Public Health/Environmental Health Division: Land Use Program (OWTS)
☒ Sheriff Department
☒ Parks and Recreation
☐ Subdivision Committee
☒ County Library

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below (x) would be potentially affected by this project.

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture/Forest | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings
of Significance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils | | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Department.)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:


- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Signature (Prepared by)

10-30-2012

Date



Signature (Approved by)

10/30/2012

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources the Lead Department cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the Lead Department has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced.)
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA processes, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15063(c)(3)(D).) In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 7) The explanation of each issue should identify: the significance threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question, and; mitigation measures identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. Sources of thresholds include the County General Plan, other County planning documents, and County ordinances. Some thresholds are unique to geographical locations.
- 8) Climate Change Impacts: When determining whether a project's impacts are significant, the analysis should consider, when relevant, the effects of future climate change on : 1) worsening hazardous conditions that pose risks to the project's inhabitants and structures (e.g., floods and wildfires), and 2)

worsening the project's impacts on the environment (e.g., impacts on special status species and public health).

1. AESTHETICS

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The two proposed residences will not significantly affect existing views in the area. There are existing houses on both sides of the proposed residences. The homes will appear to be part of an existing low density residential neighborhood.

b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The properties are not near any existing trails. The closest trail is within the Cold Creek Valley Preserve, over a half mile to the east, where the Lower Stunt High Trail is located. The Backbone Trail is located approximately one mile to the south of the properties. Since these trails are located at higher elevations, it's possible that the proposed residences may be visible from some areas of these trails, but because of the long distance they would not significantly affect views from either trail. Since there are existing residences on both sides of the proposed residences, the homes will appear to be part of an existing low-density residential neighborhood, if they are visible at all from the trails.

c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

According to current maps on the website of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the properties are not near a state scenic highway. However, a resolution was passed by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors on September 12, 2006 to request that Caltrans favorably consider designating as scenic the stretch of Mulholland Highway from Old Topanga Canyon Road to State Highway 1, which includes the frontage of the subject properties. The proposed residences will be visible from Mulholland Highway but will be set back 141'-9" from the highway for 25066 Mulholland Highway (Parcel 28) and 44'-3" for 25080 Mulholland Highway (Parcel 27). The house on parcel 28 will be obscured by trees. The house on parcel 27 will be closer to the road than parcel 28, but will be obscured by an existing hillside north of the house, which is nearly as high as the residence. The 44'-3" front setback is comparable to other neighboring existing houses on the same road, including 25084 and 25053 Mulholland Highway, which are closer to the right-of-way line than the proposed residence on Parcel 27. Neither of the proposed residences will significantly impact scenic views along the highway. No existing buildings are located on the properties. No significant landforms or geologic features were identified on the site that are unique to the area, including rock outcroppings, according to the biological resources assessment prepared by Steven G. Nelson, the consulting biologist. Few, if any, trees would need to be removed for the proposed residences.

d) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The west house (Parcel 27) will be 26 feet in height, with an adjacent hillside of approximately 20 feet high in front of it, blocking the view from the north side of most of the house. A neighboring home west of Parcel 27 is approximately 45 feet from the closest part of the proposed residence, but there will be trees in between to obscure the view of the proposed house. The west house (parcel 27) will be nearly 160 feet from the east property line and over 330 feet from the rear corner of the property. The east house (Parcel 28) has a height of nearly 30 feet above grade on the slope on the west side of the structure at the highest point above the adjacent grade, although the height is 26'-10" for the main part of the structure. Because of the slope, the house appears higher than 38 feet when viewed from the west side, but this is because the higher part of the structure is at a higher base elevation, and it is actually below the 35 foot height limit as defined in the Zoning Code, which measures height at the perimeter of the structure based on the grade at the point being measured. The east house is set back 141'-9" feet in the front, 61'-6" on the west side, 63'-11" on the east side and 290'-3 1/2" in the rear. It will be over 220 feet between the new structures on parcels 27 and 28. The proposed sizes of the new homes (6,918 square feet for parcel 28 and 5,005 square feet for parcel 27) are comparable to existing residences in the neighborhood. The style of the proposed residences is compatible with existing residences in the area. Trees and the natural topography will help screen the view of the residences. The proposed homes will use earth tone colors to better blend in with the natural surroundings and minimize impacts to the viewshed. The visual character of the area will not be significantly impacted by the construction of the proposed residences.

e) Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

☐
☐
☒
☐

The residence on parcel 28 is approximately 45 feet lower than the house on the lot immediately to the east (Parcel 29) because of the natural topography. Due to the difference in elevation, shadows from the house on parcel 28 should have minimal effect on parcel 29. Any shadows from the house on Parcel 28 are unlikely to have much effect on parcel 27 or parcels further east since they would normally be overshadowed by the higher natural topography from parcel 29. The existing topography and vegetation would appear to minimize any visual impacts from the home on parcel 27 on surrounding properties, including shadows. Nighttime lighting and glare will likely be regulated by the pending Rural Outdoor Lighting District ordinance, which is not yet in effect, but which is expected to be adopted soon. As conditions of approval, the proposed residences will still be asked to keep exterior lighting fixtures to under 800 lumens in intensity, at low height, using shielding to prevent glare on surrounding properties and undeveloped areas and to use motion detectors for outdoor security lighting, as well as any other regulations in effect at the time of construction.

2. AGRICULTURE / FOREST

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The properties being developed do not contain any land mapped as prime farmland or unique farmland on the Los Angeles Important Farmland map dated 2008 produced by the Farmland mapping and Monitoring Program.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The properties are zoned A-1-1 (Light Agriculture), and this zone allows one single-family residence per parcel. The properties are not in a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area nor do Williamson Act contracts exist on the parcels.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code § 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code § 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Neither property is zoned for forest land or timberland.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

No native trees or woodlands occur on or near the areas where the residences are proposed. The areas being developed with the two new residences consist of disturbed and ruderal chaparral and mixed chaparral, most of which has already been cleared.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Both parcels are zoned for agricultural use, although no agricultural uses are known to have occurred on the parcels. The parcels could still potentially support accessory agricultural uses, even with a home on each parcel, and any loss of potential agricultural land is minimal. No forest land will be impacted by the proposed residences.

3. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The amount of emissions to be produced by the project, the two proposed residences, was estimated using CAIEMod, the California Emissions Estimator Model, a software program developed by ENVIRON International Corporation in collaboration with SCAQMD to estimate air pollutant emissions for projects being reviewed by local agencies. The results were compared with the SCAQMD Air Quality Significance thresholds. The amount of pollutants for all listed types was far below the significance thresholds. Although some air pollution will result from the project, particularly during the construction phase, it is well below the significance thresholds set by SCAQMD for construction. Once construction is completed, the amount of air pollution generated will be much lower than during construction, and far below the SCAQMD significance operation thresholds.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The emissions will be well below SCAQMD significance thresholds for both construction and operation. The project will not contribute substantially to any existing or projected air quality violation.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

According to the 2007 Air Quality Management Plan from SCAQMD, the Los Angeles Basin region is currently in non-attainment for two criteria pollutants, ozone and fine particulate matter (PM2.5). The PM2.5 significance threshold during construction and operation is 55 pounds per day. Estimated PM2.5 emissions for the project are 2.3 pounds per day during construction and 0.05 pounds per day during operation. There is no single SCAQMD threshold for ozone, but there are significance thresholds for the ozone precursors nitrous oxide (NOx) and Carbon Monoxide (CO). The project estimates were 32.3 pounds per day for NOx during construction and 0.57 pounds during operation, compared to significance thresholds of 100 pounds per day for construction and 55 pounds per day for operations. For CO, estimated emissions for the project are 22.4 lbs./day during construction and 1.92 lbs./day during operation. The CO significance thresholds are 550 lbs./day for construction and operation. None of the

criteria pollutants generated by the project are close to exceeding any SCAQMD significance threshold or would substantively worsen the level of non-attainment in the region. Still, dust control measures will be implemented through Best Management Practices as regulated by the Department of Public Works to keep dust and particulate matter to a minimum.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

☐☐☒☐

The only nearby use which may qualify as a sensitive receptor is a parcel of county park land approximately 480 feet to the southwest. However, due to the low level of estimated air pollutants to be generated by the project, which are well below SCAQMD significance thresholds, and the distance to the park land or any other sensitive uses, any potential impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

☐☐☒☐

No objectionable odors are expected to be created as a result of the project. No farm animals are proposed and no substances with strong odors are proposed or anticipated to be used on the property.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

No special status, sensitive or candidate species were identified on the properties in the Biological Resources Assessment (BRA) prepared in January, 2012 by Steven G. Nelson, the consulting biologist. No federal or state-listed threatened or endangered wildlife species were observed, reported or expected to occur on the site by the consulting biologist. There were no state or federal rare, endangered or threatened species observed or expected to occur on the properties. Neither of the properties are known to have had any occurrences of sensitive species based on the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) maps for the area as mapped in the GIS-Net3 maps maintained by the Department of Regional Planning (DRP). The nearest area with known sensitive species mapped in the CNDDDB is approximately 1,700 feet northwest of the west parcel. However, several species of concern to resource agencies are expected. The locations of the residences relatively close to Mulholland Highway and away from Cold Creek helps to minimize potential impacts to biological resources to the extent practicable. Recommendations regarding the siting and design of the residences and landscaping were made by the consulting biologist to help protect biological resources. The Environmental Review Board (ERB) also made recommendations regarding the fuel modification zones, landscaping, and erosion control. Implementation of these recommendations will help to keep any potential impacts to a minimum and reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. These recommendations shall be made conditions of approval for each residence.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFG or USFWS?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The area being developed is classified as disturbed/ruderal chaparral and mixed chaparral, which are not generally considered sensitive habitats. However, the property is within in a Significant Watershed, which is classified as a Sensitive Environmental Resource Area (SERA), except for approximately the north 100 feet near Mulholland Highway, which is not in any SERA, but which is in the Cold Creek Significant Ecological Area (SEA), along with the rest of the subject properties. The SERA requirements supersede the SEA requirements for areas that are in both areas. The properties drain to Cold Creek, which is located approximately 380 feet south of the southern tip of parcel 28. No blue line streams exist within the subject properties. No oak trees are located on these properties, except for scrub oaks (*Quercus berberidifolia*).

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally or state protected wetlands (including, but not limited to,

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, and drainages) or waters of the United States, as defined by § 404 of the federal Clean Water Act or California Fish & Game code § 1600, et seq. through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No wetlands are located on the properties. The nearest mapped wetlands according to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Wetlands Mapper GIS program is Cold Creek. Cold Creek is approximately 380 to the south of parcel 28. The applicants will need to submit a drainage plan to the Department of Public Works (DPW) prior to beginning work related to the proposed residences, and erosion control requirements shall be determined by DPW at the time of building permit and grading permit plan check. Erosion control measures required by DPW shall be followed to ensure that any potential adverse impacts to Cold Creek will be avoided.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

No Wildlife Migration Corridor, Significant Ridgeline, Blue Line Stream or other areas identified as significant fish or wildlife migration routes exist on the subject properties. The development of the homes will not impede fish or wildlife movement in any significant way. No fencing around the properties is currently proposed, and a condition of site plan approval will be that fencing shall be restricted to security fencing immediately around the proposed residences. Perimeter fencing shall not be allowed on the properties so that wildlife can continue to move freely about the area.

e) Convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) or otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, southern California black walnut, etc.)?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The oak tree statements for both properties indicate that there are no oak trees on the properties. Scrub oaks are indicated in the BRA reports for both parcels prepared by the consulting biologist, but no ordinance-sized oak trees or oak woodlands have been document on either property. There are no walnut, juniper or Joshua trees on either parcel according to the consulting biologist's reports.

f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215), and Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas (SERAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.44, Part 6)?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No encroachment or removal of any ordinance-sized oak tree is proposed on either property. The proposed development shall follow the standards established for Significant Watersheds in the Malibu Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan (LUP).

g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan?

☐☐☐☒

The subject properties are not located within a California Natural Community Conservation Plan or a federal Endangered Species Act Habitat Conservation Plan. The properties are in the Malibu Local Coastal program Land Use Plan (LUP). The LUP contains policies protecting environmental resources, including protection of wildlife habitat. The proposed residences will be developed consistent with these policies.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

There are no structures on the properties. There are no historic resources on the properties that are on the list of historic resources and points of interest designated by the State of California within unincorporated Los Angeles County, and there are no known historic resources on the properties that meet the criteria in the CEQA historic resource eligibility criteria.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

There are no known archeological resources on the properties. However, the potential still exists for unknown resources to be uncovered during grading or construction. If any such resources are discovered during grading or construction of the project then all work must be stopped and the South Central Coastal Information Center at the California State University Fullerton, Department of Anthropology, must be notified immediately. A certified archeological resource specialist would need to be retained by the applicant to ensure the protection of archeological resources in the event that such resources are discovered on the site. Work may not resume on the site in this situation until clearance is given by the archeological specialist.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

No unique geological features or rock formations are known to exist on the properties, based on the BRAs prepared by the consulting biologist and on the Environmental Assessment prepared by the applicant. If any paleontological resources are discovered, then work on the project shall be halted and the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum shall be notified. A certified paleontological resource specialist would need to be retained by the applicant to ensure the protection of paleontological resources in the event that such resources are discovered on the site. Work may not resume on the site in this situation until clearance is given by the paleontological specialist.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The properties are not known or suspected to have ever been used as a cemetery or to contain human remains. Grading always has a potential to uncover unknown resources. If human remains are discovered, all applicable laws with respect to human remains, including notification to the county coroner, will need to

be followed. If any human remains are discovered on the site, then work on the project shall be halted and the Los Angeles County Coroner shall be notified. If any human remains are of Native American origin, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall also be notified. Only after they have been consulted and have taken all necessary actions to determine the best course of action may the work proceed, in accordance with their instructions and all applicable laws.

6. ENERGY

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

- a) Conflict with Los Angeles County Green Building Ordinance (L.A. County Code Title 22, Ch. 22.52, Part 20 and Title 21, § 21.24.440) or Drought Tolerant Landscaping Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 21, § 21.24.430 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52, Part 21)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The residences will be designed to comply with Los Angeles County Green Building Standards. These standards include being 15% more energy efficient than the Title 24 2005 California Energy Efficiency Standards, recycling or reusing at least 50% of non-hazardous construction debris by weight, installing a smart irrigation controller and planting at least two 15-gallon trees and/or maintaining existing mature trees. At least 75% of landscaping in front of the residences will need to be drought tolerant

- b) Involve the inefficient use of energy resources (see Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposal is for the construction of a single-family residence and related improvements on each of the two contiguous parcels, including a separate on-site driveway for each parcel. The new residences will be required to conform to the policies and standards of the Malibu Local Coastal Plan and to comply with the County's Green Building Program to maximize on-site energy efficiency.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known active fault trace? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

No Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone is located on the properties or in the vicinity, based on the California Geological Survey map from 2007 for the Malibu Beach quadrangle.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

There is no known active fault trace in the area. No seismic hazards are shown on the property according to the Seismic Hazards map layers in the E-Net GIS mapping application. There is still a potential for strong seismic ground shaking. The project will be required by the Department of Public Works Building and Safety division to comply with all applicable building codes to ensure safety and the integrity of building.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The property does not contain any Liquefaction Zone according to the Liquefaction Zone map in the GIS-Net3 mapping application.

iv) Landslides?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

The proposed residence on the east parcel is located within a landslide area according to the GIS-Net 3 application. The residence on the west parcel will also be located partly in a landslide area. Further analysis will be required by the Department of Public Works Geotechnical and Materials Engineering Division to evaluate the potential landslide hazard and to require any necessary soil stabilizing or soil mitigation measures.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Grading and drainage plans must be approved by the Department of Public Works (DPW) prior to the commencement of work on the site. Erosion potential is high due to the identified landslide area and steep slopes. ERB recommended that a silt fence backed up with hay bales at the toe of the slopes on the west parcel be installed to catch sediments and dislodged rocks and provide adequate erosion control during grading and construction activities. The drainage plan must be reviewed by the DPW Land Development Division, Grading and Drainage Section prior to beginning the project. All applicable requirements shall be implemented to insure that erosion and topsoil loss will be minimized.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Both home sites are either completely in or partially in an area identified as a landslide area. The project will be required to comply with all Building and Safety requirements. Further analysis will be required by the Department of Public Works Geology and Materials Engineering Division to evaluate the potential landslide hazard and other potential soil stability issues and to require any necessary soil stabilizing or soil mitigation measures. The proposed homes and project sites will be subject to all current Building and Safety and Public Works requirements to protect future residents and visitors from any potential hazards, as well as surrounding properties.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (DPW) shall evaluate expansive soil potential of site and related safety issues at the time of the building permit application. No problems with expansive soil have been identified at this time, based on the information submitted by the applicant. The project must comply with all requirements of DPW prior to construction, including soil and geology requirements. DPW will require a soils and geology report that will address any potential problems from expansive soil.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The Los Angeles County Department of Public Health Environmental Health Division shall evaluate the suitability of the soil for a septic system. No problems with waste water disposal have been identified at this time. The project is required to get approval of septic feasibility and comply with all requirements of Public Health prior to issuance of a building permit.

f) Conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215) or hillside design standards in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project includes two homes by two separate owners on contiguous hillside lots. Although the area to be developed includes land on slopes exceeding a slope of 25%, the project qualifies for an exemption from the hillside conditional use permit requirement under Section 22.56.215 C3 of Title 22, because there are individual single-family residences proposed with separate individual owners for each parcel. One home is proposed by each of the two property owners. Grading for the project shall minimize disturbance to existing topographical forms and preserve significant natural features. These and other applicable guidelines of the Hillside Design Guidelines manual shall be followed.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

☐

 ☐

 ☒

 ☐

The emissions created in relation to the project are not expected to be significant with regard to GhGs, climate change or other aspects of the environment. The emissions levels are well below the SCAQMD significance thresholds. The SCAQMD significance threshold for CO2 is 10,000 metric tons per year for industrial facilities. There is no separate SCAQMD threshold for other uses. The estimated CO2 emissions for the project are 487 metric tons per year for construction and 54.5 metric tons per year during operation. The project will comply with the Green Building requirements of the Zoning Code and the Building Code. The residences will be required to be at least 15% more energy efficient than Title 24 2005 California Energy Efficiency Standards and comply with all other applicable Green Building regulations.

b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

☐

 ☐

 ☒

 ☐

The proposal does not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation related to greenhouse gases because it will be designed to comply with the Green Building requirements and all other applicable regulations. The small scale of the project will not result in a significant increase in greenhouse gas emissions and is well below the established significance threshold.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project does not involve the use or storage of hazardous materials. It will be two single-family residences, and no hazardous substances are expected to be used or stored on the site except for normal household items.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project would not create conditions where there is a potential for the release of hazardous materials into the environment or that would pose a hazard to the public. No hazardous materials shall be used or stored on the properties.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No hazardous materials, substances or waste will be handled and no hazardous emissions will be produced on the sites. No hazardous materials shall be used or stored on the properties.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The properties are not on the list of hazardous waste and substances sites (Cortese list) maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The properties are not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of any airport.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No private airstrips are located in the vicinity.

g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The proposal would not impair implementation of an emergency response or evacuation plan or physically interfere with such a plan. It will need to obtain approval from the Fire Department to insure that it will comply with emergency response and evacuation plans and other fire safety requirements.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, because the project is located:

i) within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4)?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

The properties are in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ). However, they shall be required to comply with all applicable code and ordinance requirements related to fire and life safety, including providing and maintaining fuel modification zones, brush clearance, fire sprinklers, fire flows, fire hydrants, water mains, access, construction requirements and all other applicable regulations. These requirements will mitigate the fire danger to life and property in the VHFHSZ and reduce the potential impacts to less than significant levels. The Fire Department Land Development unit shall address all fire and life safety requirements before building permits can be issued.

ii) within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Access shall comply with Los Angeles County Fire Department requirements. A 20-foot wide driveway with a length of approximately 87 feet is proposed for the west residence. A 20-foot wide driveway with a length of approximately 200 feet is proposed for the east residence. The driveway measurements do not include an approximately 25 foot long section within the Mulholland Highway right-of-way connecting to the paved highway. Both residences also have unobstructed five-foot wide walking access around the entire perimeter of the buildings.

iii) within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The properties are served by a public water system. Water pressure and fire flow for the proposed residences have not yet been verified. The applicant will be required to meet the water flow requirements of

the Fire Department before the issuance of building permits.

iv) within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard?

☐☐☒☐

No neighboring land uses are dangerous fire hazards. No refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing or other dangerous fire hazards are located in the vicinity. The only other neighboring uses are single-family residences and vacant land. They are all in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, so the area is susceptible to fires, but the subject property and the neighboring uses are required to comply with Fire Department requirements for Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones to minimize fire danger.

i) Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?

☐☐☒☐

The proposed residences shall be required to comply with the Fire Department requirements for Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones to minimize fire danger. Potential for fire still exists in the area due to the fact that it is in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, but the proposed residences will need to comply with current fire safety standards and thus will not constitute a dangerous fire hazard to the surrounding area.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The residences will need to obtain approval from the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health (DPH) Environmental Health Division for their septic systems. All standards for waste water disposal for the septic systems will need to be met prior to issuance of a building permit.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Water for the residences will be from a public source, not from private water wells. New impervious surfaces for the residences and driveways will affect drainage. The project must comply with Low Impact Development (LID) standards to promote best management practices and to promote infiltration of stormwater and storage and beneficial use of stormwater runoff. LID requirements shall be determined by DPW. Proposed LID requirements for each residence include a 200 gallon cistern for storing rainwater, at least two trees planted overhanging impervious surfaces and directing runoff toward pervious surfaces. A drainage plan and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) will need to be approved by DPW prior to issuance of grading and building permits to ensure that the residences and related development will be designed in a way to protect groundwater resources.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Grading is proposed for the residences, but it is not expected to substantially alter existing drainage patterns or create erosion problems. No grading is proposed near any stream or river. Proposed grading includes 980 cubic yards of cut and 980 cubic yards of fill for the east parcel. Estimated import is 100 cubic yards for the east parcel. Proposed grading for the west parcel includes 1,050 cubic yards of cut and 950 cubic yards of fill, plus 400 cubic yards of overexcavation / alluvial removal and compaction. Grading, drainage and SUSMP plans shall be reviewed by DPW before grading and building permit issuance to verify that substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site will be avoided. DPW shall verify that the development adheres to the approved grading and drainage plans and that any problems are avoided or adequately mitigated.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

☐☐☒☐

Drainage will be affected by the creation of new impervious area and by the proposed grading. Estimated impervious area is 10,925 square feet for the east parcel and 6,209 square feet for the west parcel. Grading and drainage plans shall be reviewed by DPW before building permit issuance to verify that the development will not result in flooding on or off-site or a substantial increase in surface runoff. No development or alterations are proposed near an existing stream or river. The project must comply with Low Impact Development (LID) requirements regarding drainage and all other applicable requirements from DPW.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

☐☐☒☐

The residences are required to comply with LID standards and all applicable code requirements to ensure that the proposed development will not result in excess runoff and will comply with LID standards. DPW will review the drainage plan prior to commencement of grading to ensure that drainage systems will not be adversely affected by the development.

f) Generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality?

☐☐☒☐

The drainage and SUSMP plan must be approved by DPW before the project is developed to ensure that the proposed development will not violate applicable NPDES requirements or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality.

g) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52)?

☐☐☐☒

The residences are required to comply with LID requirements, which will be verified by DPW. Proposed LID requirements for each residence include a 200 gallon cistern for storing rainwater, at least two trees planted overhanging impervious surfaces and directing runoff toward pervious surfaces.

h) Result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance?

☐☐☒☐

The properties are part of the Malibu Creek watershed. Malibu Creek empties into the ocean approximately 4 miles east of Latigo Point, which is the beginning of the nearest Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS) designated by the State Water Resources Control Board. The ASBS name is Mugu Lagoon to Latigo Point. Runoff from the property would eventually reach the ocean at the mouth of Malibu Creek. Because of the distance to the nearest ASBS and the minimal amount of pollution expected to be generated by the project, the impacts to the ASBS will be less than significant.

i) Use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course)?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

There are no known septic tank limitations in the area of the project. It is not in an area designated for a moratorium on new septic systems. A separate septic system is proposed for each residence. In order to analyze the adequacy of the proposed septic systems, DPH Environmental Health Division must review the septic system prior to issuance of building permits to verify that all requirements are met and any potential negative impacts are avoided. A preliminary feasibility report shall be submitted to DPH's Land Use Program for review and approval. The report shall be prepared in compliance with DPH's "A Professional Guide to Requirements and Procedures for Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems (OWTS)". The report shall consist of a soil profile excavation, exploratory boring to determine historic and seasonal high groundwater mark and presence of subsurface water, and percolation testing to confirm that the soil on the property can support the use of OWTS. Testing shall be conducted in an area likely to be utilized as a disposal field for each property. This testing must be completed prior to issuance of building permits. Any questions regarding the DPH requirements may be directed to DPH Environmental Health Division at (626) 430-5382.

j) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project will not substantially degrade water quality, and DPW and Environmental Health will verify that the project complies with all requirements to protect water quality. The septic systems will need to meet all Environmental Health standards to prevent degradation of the water quality.

k) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, or within a floodway or floodplain?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No housing is proposed within a flood hazard area, floodway or floodplain. Neither property contains any area that is within the 100-year Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood zone. The nearest FEMA flood zone is the 100-year flood plain of Cold Creek, which is over 300 feet to the south of the properties. The residences are each 600 feet or more from the FEMA flood zone. The building pads are 140 feet or higher above the edge of the FEMA flood zone.

l) Place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No structures are proposed within a flood hazard area, floodway or floodplain. Neither property contains any area that is within the 100-year Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood zone.

m) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

☐☐☐☒

There is no Dam Inundation Area on or near the properties according to the GIS-Net3 map showing areas that have the potential to be flooded after a catastrophic failure of a dam. The closest mapped Dam Inundation Area is nearly two miles to the southwest. The edge of the potential inundation area is nearly 500 feet lower in elevation than either of the building pads.

n) Place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

☐☒☐☐

The properties are not close to any tsunami inundation area. The nearest Potential Tsunami Inundation Zone is four miles to the south according to the GIS-Net3 map. No potential seiche inundation areas are near the properties. Potential seiche inundation areas are determined by referring to the Dam Inundation Area layer in GIS-Net3. The proposed residence on the east parcel is located within a landslide area according to the GIS-Net 3 application. Potential mudflow areas are determined by identifying the Landslide Zone layer in GIS-Net3. The residence on the west parcel will also be located partly in a landslide area. Further analysis will be required by the Department of Public Works Geotechnical and Materials Engineering Division to evaluate the potential landslide hazard and to require any necessary soil stabilizing or soil mitigation measures.

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project would not create any barriers dividing the community. The development of the two single-family residences is compatible with the existing rural community around it, including low-density single-family residential development to the east, west and north.

- b) Be inconsistent with the applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to, the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The west parcel has an area of 1.7 acres and the east parcel has an area of 2.74 acres. The parcels are in the Malibu Local Coastal Plan (LCP) and are both in two plan categories, Rural Land III and Mountain Land. The Rural Land III category includes approximately the north third of the east parcel and the north half of the west parcel. The remaining area of each of the parcels is in the Mountain Land Category. The Rural Land III category allows one dwelling unit per two acres and Mountain Land allows one unit per 20 acres. The parcels do not meet current density requirements of the LCP. However, the parcels were both created in 1972 under Certificates of Exception (CE 13845 for the east parcel and CE 13842 for the west parcel) before the adoption of the LCP in 1986. Certificates of Compliance were recorded for each parcel, RCOC 200700007 for the east parcel and CC 03-17E for the west parcel. Both Certificates of Compliance are unconditional. Both parcels are legal lots created before the LCP and one home may potentially be built on each one. The proposed development is consistent with the other policies of the LCP. The property is not in a Community Standards District.

- c) Be inconsistent with the County zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject property? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The proposed development is consistent with the zoning (A-1-1, Light Agriculture, one acre minimum lot size). The A-1-1 zone allows one single-family residence per legal property as a permitted use. The proposed residences are consistent with all development standards of the Zoning Code, including height, setbacks, and development standards for single-family residences.

- d) Conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The proposal is consistent with Hillside Management requirements of the Zoning Code. No conditional use permit is required per Section 22.56.215 since only one single-family residence is proposed by each property owner. The east parcel is owned by Dr. Edward Betz and the west parcel is owned by Gayle L.

Pepper. It is also consistent with the Regional Planning Hillside Design Guidelines. Grading for the project shall minimize disturbance to existing topographical forms and preserve significant natural features. Grading shall comply with safety requirements as well as preserve a natural-looking appearance as much as possible, consistent with the Hillside Design Guidelines. The properties are both located in the Cold Creek Significant Ecological Area (SEA). However, since only one residence is proposed by each owner, the SEA requirements do not apply under the exemption in Section 22.56.215 C3 of the Zoning Code. The properties are also mostly within a Sensitive Environmental Resource Area (SERA) in the LCP, a Significant Watershed. There are no other SERAs on the subject property. Because of the SERA, both projects were reviewed by the Environmental Review Board (ERB). On May 21, 2012, ERB determined both residences to be consistent with modifications with regard to the LCP. The modifications were the conditions recommended by ERB for the same proposed residences, which they reviewed previously on February 25, 2008. The modifications were for the Fuel Modification Zones and erosion control, and these modifications have been and will be incorporated into the project. The proposed development will be consistent with LCP requirements.

12. MINERAL RESOURCES

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

There are no known mineral resources on the project site and the project would not result in the loss or availability of any valuable mineral resources. It is not identified as a Mineral Resource Area on the Special Management Area map of the Los Angeles County General Plan or the Natural Resource Areas Map in the Draft General Plan.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The property is not designated as a mineral resource recovery site on any land use plan.

13. NOISE

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the County General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Temporary construction related noise will occur during grading and construction. The developer must adhere to the standards in Los Angeles County Code Section 12.08.440 for construction noise. After completion of construction the exterior noise standards of Section 12.08.390 of Title 12 will be applicable. Noise is not expected to be any more than a normal single-family residence. The nearest residence is approximately 20 feet west of the west parcel. Another residence is approximately 80 feet east of the east parcel. These and other nearby residences are likely to be affected by construction noise, but if the hours of operation, noise levels, and the criteria established in the Noise Control ordinance are adhered to, then impacts will be less than significant. Construction activities shall not be done on Sundays or legal holidays or after 7:00 p.m. or before 7:00 a.m. on days when construction occurs to minimize noise impacts. Proposed work schedule is between 8:00 am and 4:00 pm.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

There are no sensitive uses in the area. There are no existing uses in the area that would be considered excessive noise generators. Surrounding uses are other single-family residences and vacant land. Noise generated by the construction of the project will not lead to excessive noise levels on neighboring uses if the Noise Control ordinance is complied with.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Noise levels will be increased slightly due to normal residential activities but there will not be a substantial permanent increase in noise levels.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from amplified sound systems?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Noise levels may be temporarily higher due to construction activities, but noise would be required to be within the levels allowed by the County Noise Control ordinance.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

☐☐☐☒

There is no airport in the area and it is not part of an airport land use plan.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

☐☐☐☒

There is no private airstrip in the area.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The two new homes would not create new roads or other infrastructure that would induce more growth. The two new single-family homes would not constitute a substantial increase in the housing supply or population of this area, which is already zoned for one residence per parcel.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No housing will be displaced as a result of the project. The parcels are currently vacant.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No people will be displaced by this project as the two parcels are currently vacant.

d) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project would not cause the regional or local population projections to be exceeded and only two households will be added. No zone change or plan amendment is requested to allow higher density than currently allowed.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

a) Would the project create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

There is an existing fire station approximately 2.2 miles from the subject properties (Fire Station 67). It is located near the corner of Cold Canyon Road and Piuma Road. The addition of two new homes in this Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone could result in potentially significant impacts, but the impacts will be mitigated through a development impact fee and compliance with applicable fire and life safety requirements. The homes will be required to be designed to meet all applicable fire safety requirements prior to receiving building permits. These include requirements for construction, access, water mains, fire flows and fire hydrants. Specific fire and life safety requirements for the construction phase will be addressed at the building fire plan check. The City of Calabasas has a development impact fee in effect in the project area. This development impact fee will be required to mitigate the impact that this project would have on fire department services.

Sheriff protection?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The development of the two proposed residences is not anticipated to have any significant effect on the level of Sheriff protection in the area.

Schools?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The properties are served by the Las Virgenes Unified School District. The addition of two residences is not expected to have a significant effect on local school service capacity. The school district has been contacted regarding the two proposed residences, but no response has been received.

Parks?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The addition of two residences is not expected to have a significant effect on local parks capacity. There are several existing parks within a mile of the properties, including Malibu Creek State Park, Cold Creek Valley Preserve, Cold Creek Canyon Preserve, Stunt Ranch, and smaller parcels of county and state park land and National Park Service land. The proposal has been reviewed by the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) for potential impacts on DPR facilities. DPR determined that the proposed project will not affect any DPR facilities.

Libraries?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

The addition of the two residences will have an impact on library service. Library fees will be assessed at the time of building permit application to mitigate the effects of increased demand on library services and

ensure that adequate library facilities will be available for the area. The residences are located in the Topanga Library service area of the County of Los Angeles Public Library. It is in County Library Planning Area 7 and subject to the County's library facilities mitigation fee, which is currently \$849 per residential unit. This fee is adjusted annually based on changes in the Consumer Price Index, so the actual fee may be higher at the time of building permits are issued.

Other public facilities?

☐☐☒☐

The proposed residences are not expected to have a significant effect on other public facilities in the area.

16. RECREATION

- | | <i>Potentially
Significant
Impact</i> | <i>Less Than
Significant
Impact with
Mitigation
Incorporated</i> | <i>Less Than
Significant
Impact</i> | <i>No
Impact</i> |
|--|---|--|---|--------------------------|
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The project would not increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks significantly and would not result in substantial physical deterioration of parks or other recreational facilities. The two new residences will only increase the local population by two families or households, and there are plentiful parks, trails, and recreational facilities currently serving the area. They include Malibu Creek State Park, Cold Creek Canyon Preserve, Cold Creek Valley Preserve, Stunt Ranch, King Gillette Ranch, Backbone Trail, Lower Stunt High Trail, Upper Stunt High Trail, Calabasas Cold Creek Trail, Secret Trail, Las Virgenes View Trail and Grassland Trail.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Does the project include neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

No new recreation facilities are proposed as part of this project. Existing recreation facilities will not need to be expanded as a result of the two proposed residences.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Would the project interfere with regional open space connectivity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Open space connectivity will not be significantly affected. The area south of the property will remain open space. The development of the two residences will occur on the north end of the parcels and will leave ample open space at the southern part of the subject properties adjacent to the large open space south of the properties extending to Cold Creek and beyond.

17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

☐
☐
☒
☐

The two new residences are not anticipated to affect the level of service of the existing transportation network. Traffic volumes in the area are relatively low. Traffic counts on Mulholland Highway at Cold Canyon Road, the closest intersection, ranged from a low of 1,529 to a high of 3,417 vehicles per day, based on traffic data collected by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (DPW) from 2006 to 2010. The highest recorded peak traffic volume was recorded on March 8, 2007 with an hourly volume of 453 vehicles beginning at 5:00 pm. These figures include traffic in both directions and counts were taken on 19 different days during this period. Two new homes are not expected to have a significant impact on traffic patterns in the area. DPW will be consulted to verify that there will be no problems with the circulation system resulting from the project. There are no bicycle paths or mass transit in the area. No conflicts with any transportation plan would be caused by this project.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program (CMP), including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the CMP for designated roads or highways?

☐
☐
☒
☐

The project proposes the development of two single family residences in a low-density part of the county with relatively low traffic volumes. There are no roads that are part of the CMP adjoining the property. DPW will be consulted to verify that the project will not exceed any congestion thresholds.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

☐
☐
☐
☒

The project will not change air traffic patterns, will not increase air traffic levels in any significant way and will not create any changes that would result in substantial air safety risks. There are no airports in the immediate area or any landmarks on the property used for aviation that would be affected. The structures will be less than 35 feet in height. No impact to air traffic patterns would result from the project.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

☐☐☒☐

The section of Mulholland Highway fronting the two properties is not on or near a curve. The driveway will be required to comply with safety standards from the Fire Department and DPW.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

☐☐☒☐

Adequate emergency access is required by the Fire Department before building permits can be issued.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

☐☐☒☐

There are no bikeways or public transit facilities in the vicinity of the project. The project will not conflict with any plans, policies or standards regarding pedestrians, bicycles and alternate transportation modes.

18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Each residence will have its own private septic system that will be required to comply with all applicable requirements. The Department of Public Health (DPH), Environmental Health Division must review the septic systems prior to project completion to verify that all standards are met.

b) Create water or wastewater system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

No wastewater treatment facilities will be required for the project as the project is proposing a private septic system on each parcel, which must comply with all applicable requirements. No capacity problems are anticipated. Environmental Health must review the septic systems prior to project completion to verify that all standards are met.

c) Create drainage system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

A drainage plan will need to be approved by DPW prior to beginning work on the project. All drainage improvements will be on-site and are not expected to cause significant environmental effects. The County LID requirements shall be applicable to each of the two residences.

d) Have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The properties are within the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD) and will have water supplied by LVMWD. LVMWD will be consulted for this project to verify that adequate water supplies exist for the two proposed residences.

e) Create energy utility (electricity, natural gas,

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Energy use on the site is not anticipated to create any capacity problems or create the need for expansion of existing facilities because only two dwellings are proposed and there are no known problems with energy system capacity in this area. The residences will be required to comply with the Green Building requirements, including energy efficiency standards. The applicant has indicated solar panels may be installed for each of the two properties.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

☐☐☒☐

The solid waste disposal needs of the site are not anticipated to create capacity problems for area landfills because only two dwellings are proposed and there are no known capacity problems at area landfills. The property is required to comply with all applicable codes and requirements regarding solid waste disposal.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

☐☐☒☐

Regulations relating to solid waste disposal must be complied with to obtain a building permit. The two residences shall be required to comply with all applicable requirements for solid waste disposal.

19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The two proposed residences shall comply with all requirements and regulations to minimize effects on the environment. The project shall incorporate ERB recommendations to reduce potential effects on the environment. No sensitive plant or animal communities are threatened by the proposal. Recommendations of the consulting biologist shall be followed to insure that plant and animal communities are protected. There are no known historical or cultural resources on the property and both properties are currently vacant.

b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

No significant environmental impacts are anticipated for the project in either the short-term or the long-term.

c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Incremental effects of the project are not significant and it does not create a cumulatively significant impact. The development of this project as proposed does not make it easier to develop other properties in the area. The driveways will only serve the two subject properties. This project will not significantly alter the character of the area or create any cumulatively significant impact. The amount of potential emissions resulting from the project will be less than significant and the project would not result in cumulative air quality impacts or any other significant cumulative impacts. There are no other current projects in the area and development of this project is not expected to lead to any significant new development.

d) Does the project have environmental effects which

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

No substantial adverse effects will be caused by the proposal, either directly or indirectly. The proposed two single-family residences will be compatible with the area and will not alter the existing neighborhood pattern significantly.